

Remarks

Claims 1-15 are currently pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 2 and 5 have been canceled and claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Claims 3, 4, 8-11 and 13-15 have been withdrawn from consideration. Therefore, claims 1, 6-7 and 12 are presented to the examiner for consideration.

The examiner kindly identified a typographical error in claims 5. Claim 5 has been canceled by this amendment.

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Loud. Loud describes a tool used in watch repair to remove the roller from the balance shaft of a timepiece. The Office Action states that the tool of Loud is seen to be capable of pushing a turret from the case of a pop-up sprinkler head like the tool of the subject invention. Applicant submits the tool of Loud would not function in this manner. The case of a pop-up sprinkler head is placed into the tool of the subject invention directing the pilot into water inlet at the bottom of the case. The pilot is then driven into the case displacing the turret. The turret is captured in its extended position by the capture means as the case of the sprinkler head is laid against and supported by the tool's elongated body. The body is an open semi-cylinder capable of receiving and supporting the entire case of the sprinkler head. The body of the tool of Loud on the other hand is a substantially closed tubular shank. The tube guides and directs a spring-biased plunger. A portion of the tube is cut-away to receive the timepiece but the cut-away section is not sufficient to receive the cylindrical case of a sprinkler head. Expanding the cut-away portion to receive such a case while retaining the tubular guide section would create an unwieldily tool contrary to the object of the invention which is to create an easy to use tool that can be operated with one hand. Loud does not suggest or describe the tool of the subject invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 5 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Loud. Claims 5 and 12 recite that the length of the elongated body is about the length of the case of the sprinkler head. As noted above, expanding the cut-away portion of the tool of Loud to receive the entire length of the case of a pop-up sprinkler head would create an unwieldily tool. The tubular guide portion for the

6

Docket No.: NEI-100
Serial No. 10/643,356

plunger of the tool of Loud appears to be about 2/3 the length of the shank. If all sections were enlarged in proportion, a long, cumbersome tool would be created. Loud does not suggest the compact, simple device of the subject invention that allows a single person to overcome the considerable spring bias of a sprinkler head turret using one hand. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any of this response, or if the Examiner believes a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,



Jean Kyle
Patent Attorney
Registration No. 36, 987
Phone No.: 406-375-1317
Fax. No. : 406-375-1318
Address : P.O. Box 2274
Hamilton, MT 59840-4274